



Trans-Lake Washington Project

Washington State Department of Transportation Sound Transit

Montlake Community Design Workshop – Executive Summary

A community design workshop for the Montlake neighborhood was held on March 26, 2002, from 3:00 until 7:30 p.m. at Saint Demetrios Greek Orthodox Church. The purpose of the workshop was to update the community on the status of the Trans Lake Washington Project and to solicit community feedback on the following issues:

- Neighborhood protection and enhancement;
- Crossing the Montlake Cut and streets north of SR 520;
- Arboretum connections and streets south of SR 520; and
- Transit service and direct access.

Over twenty invitees attended the workshop. For a list of participants and project team in attendance, please see Appendix C. Invitees were selected based on the proximity of their business, property, or residence to the SR 520 corridor. Approximately thirty-five invitations were distributed electronically or by mail. Each invitee who did not respond to the invitation was contacted by phone the day prior to the workshop to remind them of the event.

After the introduction of the project team, including representatives from Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Sound Transit (ST), City of Seattle Transportation, and consultants, participants were provided a report of the project's status and objectives for the workshop. Workshop participants then broke into smaller groups and were directed to four working stations. Each station was focused around one of the major issues and staffed by project team members. Attendees were encouraged to ask questions and give feedback on the issues by talking with staff, marking on existing interchange diagrams, and filling out comment forms.

Following the small working sessions, the group was reassembled and each station leader reported major issues raised at each table. Overall themes included:

- ✓ Some participants were interested in the trade-off between modifying the existing Montlake Bridge versus creating a second crossing of the Montlake Cut. When looking at widening the Montlake Bridge, the team should consider the historical significance of the structure.
- ✓ Participants were interested in maintaining pedestrian/bicycle continuity and increasing it beyond what the team had proposed.
- ✓ Participants were interested in maintaining transit access for the Montlake community, if a new ST Central Link Station in the Pacific/Montlake area is constructed.
- ✓ Participants were interested in continuing to look at the tradeoffs of relocating access to SR 520 to Lake Washington Boulevard from the existing Montlake Boulevard on and off ramps.

Montlake Community Design Workshop – Draft Summary

Welcome, Introductions and Meeting Objectives

Pat Serie, EnviroIssues, introduced the project team to the community, including representatives from the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), Sound Transit (ST), and City of Seattle Transportation.

The purpose of the community design workshop was to relate the current status of the project, discuss the current and evolving design process, and to obtain input from the community regarding unresolved design issues. The format of the workshop was as follows:

- Outline of outstanding alternatives design issues; opportunity for clarifying questions
- Roundtable workshop sessions to provide feedback on drawings, maps
- Report back from roundtable participants; remaining issues for follow-up discussion

Outline of Outstanding Alternatives Design Issues; Opportunity for Clarifying Questions

Les Rubstello, WSDOT, reminded the group that the City of Seattle Transportation, while not a project co-sponsor, represents the elected officials from Seattle sitting on the Executive Committee and is sponsoring the workshops along with WSDOT and Sound Transit so they can listen first-hand to the community's concerns about the project.

The project team members present at the workshop are those responsible for designing the interchanges for each of the project's alternatives. Input is sought from workshops participants, specifically on the six and eight lane alternatives.

The current funding for the project will be spent between now and December 2002. The statewide vote on an increase in the gas tax in November 2002 will determine future project funding. The limited funding available between now and the end of the year may prevent the project team from beginning to write the draft environmental impact statement (EIS) until 2003.

Jeff Peacock, Parametrix, outlined the outstanding design issues and briefly described the opportunities for community input.

1. Confirmation of likely Montlake Boulevard interchange design. There are several Montlake interchange options, such as including a second crossing of Montlake cut or widening Montlake Boulevard. Issues to be considered include: access options to SR 520 from Montlake Boulevard; Arboretum access; and through traffic from Arboretum to the University of Washington. Comments on these design issues or new options are welcomed from the participants.
2. Transit service and direct transit access to UW. The main transit service will be serving the University. With the six and eight lane alternatives, how will HOV direct access or HOV/BRT direct access work with the existing interchange options? How do present or future flyer stops work?
3. Local street impacts and mitigation. If general purpose capacity is added to SR 520, there will be impacts to local streets. How should these be resolved?

4. Montlake Cut crossing options. What options may be acceptable for an additional crossing of the Montlake Cut to provide for added HOVs, buses, and/or single occupant cars?
5. Potential lid locations and neighborhood connectivity opportunities. What are the tradeoffs with the potential lid locations?
6. Stormwater treatment options. Locations of stormwater facilities are indicated on the designs. What are your thoughts on how the ponds and overall system should look like?
7. Museum of History and Industry (MOHAI) site options. Looking at three different types of uses for the current MOHAI site, which is preferable?

To address the outstanding issues as listed above, the workshop was broken into four stations. Each station contained drawings and maps of the Montlake area. Members of the project team, specifically those who drew the designs, were present at each station to provide explanation, answer questions, and to record public comment. The stations were as follows:

- Station 1: Neighborhood protection and enhancement;
- Station 2: Crossing the Montlake Cut and streets north of SR 520;
- Station 3: Arboretum connections and streets south of SR 520; and
- Station 4: Transit service and direct access.

Based on the project status, workshop objectives, and outstanding design issues presented by Les Rubstello and Jeff Peacock, the following questions and issues were raised by participants.

- What about the alternative designs that not being discussed today?
- Participation in the workshop should not indicate an endorsement of all of the alternatives. Some participants are not in favor of any of the alternatives being presented.
- The community is losing track of what problem this project is trying to solve. We would like this question and answer to be at the forefront of the discussion, so members of the community know how to respond. *The 47-member study committee took four months to describe the problem, which is to increase the person-carrying capacity across the lake. Also, WSDOT wants to replace the bridge in 20 years. If the bridge is going to be replaced – should we do something else?*
- Is performance including in “carrying capacity?” If you have more lanes, doesn’t it mean you will get there faster? *The project is trying to improve mobility for people, meaning the number of people who can cross the lake on SR 520. That does not necessary translate to an increase in the speed of traffic moving across the bridge.*
- It is important to remember that none of the alternatives solve the whole problem. More people want to cross the lake than will be accommodated by the four, six, or eight lane alternatives. The bottleneck is the bridge – not the local streets. If capacity is added to the bridge, many of the problems on local streets will be moved to the bridge. For example, the congestion on the Montlake Bridge will be on the SR 520 bridge. People are backed up because they cannot get on the bridge. It is also important to remember that the life span of the bridge is short lived. When replacing the bridge you have an opportunity to do something for the future. The EIS provides an opportunity to assess it.
- Typically an EIS evaluates, makes no decision, but discloses the impacts and gives mitigating measures. It does not address cost issues. What is going to be the basis for

making decisions? *There are three committees: executive, technical, and advisory. All will have a part in making a recommendation to WSDOT and Sound Transit. Seattle has four votes on the eighteen-member executive committee.*

- In the end, it simply becomes a cost-benefit exercise. Clearly there is a separate cost analysis. Is there a level of impact that is too big? How do you minimize or contain the impacts? *WSDOT does an EIS, discloses the impacts and does a cost-benefit analysis.*
- None of the information presented so far is new to the community. It is still destroying wetlands, shorelands, property values, etc. It continues to be outrageous.
- What is the design speed for six-lane facility? *Sixty miles per hour.*
- Has the community not unequivocally stated that a second crossing is unacceptable? What options are being considered that do not include the second crossing? *By providing a second crossing of Montlake Cut, traffic impacts on Montlake Boulevard have decreased considerably. The executive committee has asked the project to consider both a second crossing and the widening of Montlake Bridge. The project is also looking at the impacts of not adding a second crossing or widening Montlake Bridge.*
- How do design speeds on the freeway relate to the spacing of on or off ramps? *There are rules for spacing between interchanges and the design speed. In this situation, the interchanges in Montlake are already there so they will not be impacted significantly.*
- The University of Washington's policy is to reduce the number of parking stalls on and off campus. Will the project suddenly begin delivering more cars to the University? *The project will be meeting with the University in April to discuss these very same issues.*
- Is the goal of the project to try to move more cars farther?
- It seems that adding general purpose capacity on Montlake Boulevard will deliver more cars into the University District. Building more buildings will also attract more traffic. This has large implications. The project is basically telling developers in the University District that it will deliver more people to their buildings. Has the City of Seattle responded to whether the neighborhood can handle this additional traffic? Who will manage the capacity?
- What does it mean to choose an interchange? A choice between the alternatives presented today or are there other alternatives that can be suggested? *The issues being presented to the community include where on and off-ramps should be located, how they should connect to local streets, and how local traffic circulation should be managed. These elements are part of the interchange options.*
- Regarding the second crossing of the Montlake Cut in a tunnel, it is assumed that it will have to be ventilated, with fire suppression, emergency exits and access. Where will this be located? *The tunnel will have to meet all fire, life, and safety standards; however, the project team has not yet determined where those facilities will be located.*

Report Back from Workshop Sessions

Pat Serie reconvened the group after an approximately two-hour session during which community members were able to participate in the four different stations. She asked each workstation to summarize the comments received and provide a list of follow-up items. For a full listing of recorded comments at each workstation, see Appendix A.

STATION 1: NEIGHBORHOOD PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT

There was no dominating opinion expressed by the participants at this table. There were a lot of questions pertaining to the function of lids and what benefits would be gained from them. A request was made to make sure parking remains sufficient with whatever option is chosen. The community is interested in what will happen at the end of each lid to mitigate the ‘trumpet’ noise and creative noise wall types.

Michael Minor, Minor & Associates, responded to an inquiry of whether noise walls could be put on a bridge. As a receptor is farther and farther away from a bridge structure, noise walls tend to have less effect on the amount of noise being heard at the receptor. There are special types of acoustic walls (made out of aluminum) with which the side that faces outside would be solid and the side that faces traffic would be perforated, which sucks in sound and keeps it from going into the surrounding areas. Drivers do not see through this type of wall. Based on the type of pavement, there can be an additional three to five decibel reduction in noise with this type of wall. Three decibels change is the smallest amount of change a human can detect.

The height of walls depends on the vehicle traffic. Passenger vehicle noise comes from the ground, so generally only a two-foot noise wall is required. Large vehicles, such as UPS trucks, that are four feet off the ground, require an eight-foot noise wall. Larger vehicles require sixteen-foot noise walls.

Action Items:

1. Provide additional perspectives of lids
2. Conduct further investigation of bridge noise walls and more visuals examples
3. Provide more information on the management of sound

STATION 2: CROSSING THE MONTLAKE CUT AND STREETS NORTH OF SR 520

[Please note, the new crossing alternative and the parallel bridge are proposed for different locations.]

Some participants were interested in the trade-off between modifying the existing Montlake Bridge versus constructing a second crossing of the Montlake Cut. Some felt that changing the existing Montlake Bridge would be the most palatable. If a second crossing is built, then the project should look at moving the ramp connections as far east of the Montlake neighborhood as possible. If a parallel bridge is built, it needs to have the same look of the current bridge. When looking at the widened Montlake Bridge option, the historical issues of the bridge need to be considered.

Action Items:

1. Provide more information on changing the existing Montlake corridor as opposed to a second crossing.
2. Look at alternatives to expand the Montlake Bridge.
3. What are the specifications of a new bridge (height, etc.)? Also, what is the architectural purpose?
4. What are the present day laws for re-building or building a new bridge (differing from those in 1917 when the bridge was constructed)?

5. Does the re-striping of I-90 to accommodate for HOV restrict the use of the corridor for flammable freight? If so, what assumptions can be made about SR 520?

STATION 3: ARBORETUM CONNECTION(S) AND STREETS SOUTH OF SR 520

Participants were interested in the westbound off ramp and its impact on transportation in the neighborhood. They were also interested in reducing the amount of traffic in the Arboretum. Some participants felt closing the existing ramps at Lake Washington Boulevard was attractive, while other participants felt that they should be maintained in their current configuration. Generally, participants were interested in reducing the total amount of impervious surface in the corridor. The neighborhood sees traffic congestion on Montlake Boulevard as the source of cut-through traffic. This should be addressed. Participants were also very interested in continuity of pedestrian/bicycle movement through the corridor and wanted to see current connections maintained and additional ones provided. There is also significant concern about impacts to wetlands and other sensitive resources. Generally, participants were interested in giving priority to transit and focusing on HOV.

Action Items:

1. More information on the feasibility of widening or adding capacity to the Montlake Bridge.
2. Possible ways to restrict the use of Madison Boulevard as a shortcut to SR 520, but retain for local use.
3. Impact of the potential closure of Arboretum ramps.
4. More information on whether, to reduce impervious surface, can shoulder width both on highways and local streets be reduced to lessen impacts to sensitive areas.
5. More discussion on the expansion of the Portage Bay Viaduct with each of the alternatives and the associated impacts.
6. Additional information on the opportunities to add HOV lanes south of University Village to the Montlake Bridge.

STATION 4: TRANSIT SERVICE AND DIRECT ACCESS

Several participants were interested in learning more about the placement of bus stops on Montlake Boulevard. They were also interested in how SR 520 transit facilities would be impacted with the proposed Sound Transit Central Link Station being located in the Pacific/Montlake area. Participants would like the Trans-Lake Washington Project to encourage a decision by Sound Transit to locate a station in the vicinity of NE Pacific and Montlake Boulevard. With this in mind, participants were also interested in an interagency (Metro, Sound Transit, WSDOT, City of Seattle) review of transit service connections to create a comprehensive look at the following: SR 520 flyer stop; service to University of Washington; thru service to the Seattle central business district; and local connections. A few participants emphasized the need to maintain a regional perspective. Generally, participants were interested in seeing an analysis of local transit service. Several participants were interested in looking at possible scenarios resulting from the potential elimination of the Montlake flyer stop. They would also like to hear further discussion of the net-gain resulting from retention of the stop and proposed maintenance practices for the flyer stop. Participants discussed the staging issues and how they related to transit. Some participants expressed concern over additional congestion with the added signal in Option I. Generally, participants would rather see an expansion of the

Montlake Bridge than a second crossing. Most agreed that the environment of pedestrian/bicycle lanes as shown in the designs is located on busy streets and should be located in more pleasant bicycling corridors.

Station 4, Follow-Up:

-
- Challenge to team to create an option without a second crossing.
- Show pedestrian / bicycle facilities on the drawings
- Illustrate HOV connections to UW. Flyer stop integration. Staging of stops.
- More significant measures to get people out of single-occupancy vehicles.
- Methodology of traffic demand management.
- Provide further information/analysis of local transit service.

Closing Remarks

Pat Serie adjourned the workshop by saying the project team is committed to return to the Montlake community to respond to the issues raised in the roundtable discussions. The summary will be made available on the Trans-Lake Washington Project website, as well as e-mailed to those who have provided their e-mail address.

For written comments, not part of the workshop dialogue, please see Appendix B.

Appendices

Appendix A, Workstation Public Comments

WORKSTATION 1: NEIGHBORHOOD PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT

Bicycle & Pedestrian

- Do not “meander” cyclists through neighborhood
- A safe route is important, but it doesn’t have to be grade separated
- Would like to keep pedestrian connection part of drive to Lake Washington

Views & Perspectives

- Would like a view of the Montlake Bridge from Hamlin Street South and a view of Lake Washington from the north
- Show what the bridge would look like from the street

Environmental

- Don’t plant more cottonwoods
- Don’t cut down old trees
- Why have 10 feet of shoulders in an environmentally sensitive and built up area?

Sound

- Lid doesn’t do us any good (visually), if you’ve got a big (30 ft.) wall on which it sits
- Explore short noise walls to channel sound toward the lake
- Western extended lid is useless. Extend to east and make diagonal
- Cantilever noise “shelf” on or over access ramps to Montlake

Other

- With a new use building on MOHAI lot, it can’t be a “busy” destination due to traffic and parking impacts
- Widen the Montlake Bridge

WORKSTATION 2: CROSSING THE MONTLAKE CUT AND STREETS NORTH OF SR 520

- Possible re-route of Montlake traffic from northbound to westbound to Pacific Street.
- Bus transfers on Pacific Street– what happens?
- Expanding Montlake Bridge? What options? – One southbound HOV lane; 2 parallel bridges, 3 lanes each; 2 HOV lanes each direction, widen from center
- Bridge (2nd crossing) takes out some recreation area at Foster Island
- The less new roads, the happier people are in the Montlake community
- Environmental impacts to marsh and Foster Island outweigh benefits of reduced traffic demand in Shelby and Hamlin area

WORKSTATION 3: ARBORETUM CONNECTION(S) AND STREETS SOUTH OF SR 520

Montlake Boulevard

- Will light at Montlake Boulevard change need for Lake Washington Boulevard?
- How can we maintain traffic during construction on Montlake Bridge?
- Enlarging the Montlake Bridge has to be done in the middle, maintain architectural features and no taking of homes
- Primary cut through from north into south neighborhoods because of back up on Montlake Boulevard
- Traffic coming from Madison wants to stay on 28th/Montlake Boulevard rather than go through Arboretum

Lake Washington Boulevard

- Maintain current movements at Lake Washington Boulevard, eliminate 2nd crossing, add southbound HOV lane to Montlake Bridge
- Move Montlake connections to Lake Washington Boulevard with tunnel concept
- Move Lake Washington Boulevard ramps as far away as possible from homes
- Look at options to restrict Madison St. (from west) access to Lake Washington Boulevard

Arboretum

- Do not eliminate access at Arboretum.
- How can we reduce as much traffic as possible in Arboretum?
- Keep roadways next to homes similar in look as roads through Arboretum
- Why not co-locate with the Sound Transit tunnel?
- Can we look at smaller shoulders on left side of roadway? Look at deviating on freeway and local streets
- Don't increase access/demand through Arboretum
- Arboretum wants to use MOHAI building when museum moves

Environmental

- Minimize amount of concrete, i.e. smaller shoulders
- Do not trade-off bicycle paths on Montlake Boulevard for trees
- Don't make it more difficult for Madison Park residents to access SR 520 (i.e. add stop lights)

Transit

- Give transit access from University to UW priority – i.e. direct access ramps
- Moving walkway from flyer stop to UW?

WORKSTATION 4: TRANSIT SERVICE AND DIRECT ACCESS

Option I

- Yet to see an effective way to serve UW with [HOV] on SR 520
- Challenge design team to create option without 2nd crossing
- Investigate transit queue-jump to Montlake Boulevard?
- Have you explored an option without HOV?
- In 4-lane alternative look at costs and improvements in transit
- Congestion due to added signal on the north of SR 520. How will it work?
- Placement of bus stops on Montlake Boulevard – could they be on the overpass structure for better transfer to flyer stop (show stairs or escalators, etc.)
- Access to flyer stops on foot and from surrounding area
- How would Sound Transit's proposed Montlake Route and Rainer Vista station impact service on SR 520?
- Can you merge SR 520 bus rapid transit (BRT) service into Central Link Line at the University of Washington?
- Origin of people to Montlake flyer stop, mostly UW?
- Possible elimination of Montlake flyer stop?
- “Net-gain” to community to have flyer stop

Option L

- Various combinations possible at crossing
- Will HOV lanes continue onto Pacific?
- Is this EIS going to analyze what happens to local transit service?
- Not just location, but analyze local service (i.e. not just UW/Downtown service) and transit service impacts
- Flyer stop is poor – pedestrian environment; pedestrian connections/facilities should be shown

Option A

- If riders go to downtown Seattle, flyer stop is essential
- If Rainer Vista station is in place, route all SR 520 buses to Link station
- Expansion of Montlake Bridge to 6 lanes a possibility instead of 2nd crossing?
- With transit-only HOV lanes on Montlake Boulevard you can have transit priority signals
- Is there a way to bring downtown-destined buses into UW, loop them around near Montlake/Pacific and then bring them downtown via SR 520 / I-5?
- “Regional perspective” of system-wide benefits of SR 520, including potential connection to central Link (include in EIS)
- Poor local traffic conditions, a direct result of SR 520 being 4-lanes
- I-5 queue-point for SR 520; source of back-up on I-5 to Northgate

- Pedestrian connections at Montlake Boulevard/Pacific -- Proposed pedestrian crossing should be illustrated; reduce design standards to tighten intersection (i.e. reduce turning radius for pedestrians)
- East Park Drive/SR 520 – major bicycle/pedestrian connection; distinguish bicycle and pedestrian connections, specifically at new crossing/SR 520
- East Park Drive, a critical pedestrian connection (emphasized) since Montlake Boulevard is not attractive
- Continuity of bicycle/pedestrian connections at SR 520/Montlake Blvd
- East Park Drive lid design should provide north-south connection for pedestrians/bicycles to Hamlin Street

Appendix B, Written Comments

Returned Comment Forms

Workstation 1 -- Neighborhood Protection and Enhancement.

Comment #1:

Small lids or textured berm slopes will be ok for noise reduction. Overall bridge noise (mid-span) is as much a problem as near houses – noise generation.

Moving Lake WA Blvd access ramps to 520 further east over water/wetlands not a good trade-off just to move traffic away from homes.

MOHAI site should be converted to open space and park use.

Comment #2:

None of these alternatives are tolerable for my opinion. Keep the existing trees that are there for even they aren't impassable with your new landscaping for your tunnel. All these propositions one lies in order to get what you want but you who are "studying aren't living in the middle of that mess and do not have young children involved that are enjoying as long as they can in that neighborhood. When we asked clear questions the answers were either too much and vague. I would like clear answers with no option!

Pechmagre [signature]

Comment #3:

Most of your audience is not trained to read engineered drawings – so their interpretation is usually inaccurate.

Rendered drawings are even hard.

Visualization in a difficulty you must overcome – Workstation #1 was graphically the easiest – yet the coordinator said people were having difficulty understanding them.

Perspectives help and they are few!

Comment #4:

[Neighborhood protection and enhancement circled] go away & lid on your way out

I object to the "solutions" arrived at and want to restate clearly that the: people who came from Montlake could not advise the TLWP on each of their preferences – Montlake sticks to the resolution! Hamlin-Shelby residents stick to the very clear and concise statement made regarding SR 520 and stay in the R.O.W.

You (TLWP) do not answer the questions that are proposed over and over by Montlakers. This workshop method where you get various people giving you different answers (unproductive) and then say, "We met with Montlake and this is what they said..." blah blah blah" and the people who were there do not recognize the comments you said were made is dishonest – and goes on all the time. This sickens me once again.

Comment #5:

Please – Please – Please – consider that Montlake has families that have lived in the area longer the 520 – They have been damaged once – All alternatives seem to further damage the environment – Please include Montlakers in the decision process –

Please remember that families have little children and children are at risk around traffic – If Montlake Bridge is the thoroughfare to the on/off ramps of the north end of Capitol Hill – High speeds will kill! – How can you justify more bridges by speeding cars up? Get people out of the cars and into buses, etc. Faster access is not the answer – Things will slow down sometime – stop the craziness and work on mass transit!

Workstation 2 – Crossing the Montlake Cut and Streets North of SR 520

Comment #6:

The (new) bridge concept over the cut east of Montlake Blvd is most elegant crossings, but the added traffic flow through arboretum is bad. Impacts on wetlands are tolerable, and better than taking residences.

Expanding Montlake Bridge (+ 2 lanes) and better ramp design may be best solution. Improved bicycle N/S connection would encourage better mode split in future. However, construction impact/traffic diversion might be horrible.

Workstation 3 – Arboretum Connection(s) and Streets South of SR 520

No comments received.

Workstation 4 – Transit Service and Direct Access

Comment # 7:

Many people on the NMFS NOAA Fisheries campus use bicycles + bus service. It would be very convenient to have a bus stop near our large campus. (employees who use public transit number over 50). Our address – 2725 Montlake Blvd. E

Electronic Comment Received

Here are a few comments concerning the March 26 Trans-Lake Washington Project Workshop.

Workstation 1. Neighborhood Protection and Enhancement

I live on Lake Washington Blvd and look directly across the street over the freeway and out over Union Bay. It's not a great view, but the thought of 15-20 foot concrete sound walls, up on an elevated highway, is not inviting. It may be better than the increased noise that will come with some of the options, but unless the walls are special, it will likely be ugly. I know Jim Kearns is suggesting cantilevered noise barriers to reduce their height. I like that idea.

Workstation 2. Crossing the Montlake Cut and Streets North of SR-520

I am concerned about anything that raises the elevation of the freeway, mainly due to noise. My wife and I purchased our home nearly 20 years ago, recognizing the noise situation at the time (and being thankful that it reduced the price of the house to something we could afford). So I've adapted to the current noise levels. I do not want them to rise significantly with only ugly mediation measures being possible. The additional freeway interchange out in front of my house and the raising of the main-line up to the street level (or higher) would significantly affect the noise level in my front yard.

I've listened to Kirk and Jeff a lot in the last couple years as they've talked with us about options for a second crossing. The steep grades associated with the current tunnel option strike me as making it an impractical answer.

Widening the Montlake Bridge is something worth further study, as is the idea of moving all the off and on ramps in Montlake to a new site east of my house. Each option comes with political and environmental problems, but they should be investigated.

Appendix C, Workshop Participants and Project Team

Name	Affiliation
Participants	
Arbes, Jerry	F.S.O.P
Aschenback, Hans	Advisory Board
Bicknell, Lyle	Montlake Res.
Bosch, Jerry	Montlake Hamlin Group
Corson, Carolyn	
Deeter, John	
Doherty Theresa	UW
Dubman, Jonathan	Montlake Comm. Club
Hart, Fred	U. District Chamber
Herkelrath, Jim	US Government
Hutchinson, John	MCC
Iverson, Scott	Montlake Business Owner
Kearnes, Jim	
Lamp, Matt	
Lane, Ted	NOISE
Marshall, Peter	Seattle Parks and Recreation Dept.
Pechmagre, Ines M	Hamlin-Shelby
Quinn, Lisa	UW Transportation Office
Reed, Tracy	Sound Transit
Smith Salosga, DF	Hamlin-Shelby
Speer, Eddie	
Stateu, Patric	Hamlin-Shelby
Stenkamp, Ron	
Talley, Bill	UW
Weed, Mark A.	Seattle Business
Project Team	
Chippis, Eric	City of Seattle Transportation
Gilliland, Barb	Sound Transit
Goldenberg, Joy	EnviroIssues
Grotefendt, Amy	EnviroIssues
Hoff, Brad	EnviroIssues
Horntvedt, Michael	Parametrix
Lohse-Clark, Kristen	Parametrix
Minor, Michael	Minor & Associates
Parker, Lorie	CH2M Hill
Peacock, Jeff	Parametrix
Phillips, Brad	Parametrix
Sanchez, Susan	City of Seattle
Schoneman, Noel	City of Seattle Transportation
Serie, Pat	EnviroIssues
Wessman, Susan	Parametrix
Wilcox, Kirk	Parametrix